



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/912,122	07/24/2001	Joshua Makower	TRNSV-015G	4515
7590 06/04/2004			EXAMINER	
Robert D. Buyan STOUT, UXA, BUYAN & MULLINS, LLP Suite 300 4 Venture Irvine, CA 92618			ISABELLA, DAVID J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3738	

DATE MAILED: 06/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/912,122

Applicant(s)

MAKOWER ET AL.

Examiner

DAVID J ISABELLA

Art Unit

3738

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 March 2004.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 12-52 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 12-45 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-9, 52 and 56 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

There is no antecedent support for "said first lumen".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 5-9,46-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milo et al (5429136) in view of either of Jang et al or Abele, et al (5693014 or 6010480).

Milo et al discloses a guide catheter 12 including an elongate catheter body having at least one lumen extending longitudinally therethrough, an opening 24 formed in the catheter body and a pressure exerting member 26 formed on the catheter body for engaging a luminal anatomical structure. While applicant argues that Milo is not

structure to prevent any location of the catheter body from moving with a luminal structure, Examiner maintains that the argument is flawed because the balloon of Milo is designed to force the catheter body against the surface of the lumen thereby locating the opening adjacent the selected tissue site. This action alone without any frictional modification to the balloon surface would perform the function of preventing the catheter from moving within the luminal structure. If this were not so, then the intended procedure of Milo could not be performed by the surgeon. Nonetheless, Examiner has applied Jang et al or Abele et al as a secondary teaching for increasing the frictional surface of a balloon catheter for increasing the engaging forces of the balloon to an adjacent luminal structure. It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art to provide the outer surface of the balloon with frictional components to increase the engaging forces of the balloon to adjacent luminal structures.

Claim 6, see column 5, lines 4-11.

Claims 7 and 8, see disclosure of Jang et al or Abele et al (columns 4-6).

Claim 9, see column 6, lines 5+.

Newly added claims 46-52 are directed to subject matter similar to that as set forth in claims 5-9 supra. No further explanation is required with respect to the combination of Milo et al as modified by either of Jang, et al or Abele et al.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/01/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Milo et al discloses a guide catheter 12 including an elongate catheter body having at least one lumen extending longitudinally therethrough, an opening 24 formed in the catheter body and a pressure exerting member 26 formed on the catheter body for engaging a luminal anatomical structure. While applicant argues that Milo is not structure to prevent any location of the catheter body from moving with a luminal structure, Examiner maintains that the argument is flawed because the balloon of Milo is designed to force the catheter body against the surface of the lumen thereby locating the opening adjacent the selected tissue site. This action alone without any frictional modification to the balloon surface would perform the function of preventing the catheter from moving within the luminal structure. If this were not so, then the intended procedure of Milo could not be performed by the surgeon.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DAVID J ISABELLA whose telephone number is 703-308-3060. The examiner can normally be reached on MONDAY-FRIDAY.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, CORRINE MCDERMOTT can be reached on 703-308-2111. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



DAVID J ISABELLA
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3738

DJI
June 1, 2004